

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claims 15-36 is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Initially, applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 19-21, 24, 25, 30-32, 35-36 if rewritten in independent form and of the withdrawal of the previous grounds of objection. By this amendment, independent claims 15 and 26 have been amended to better clarify the novel features of the invention and the distinction thereof over the cited art, as more fully discussed below.

More particularly, with respect to the new rejection of Claims 15 to 18, 22, 23, 26 to 29, 33 and 34 over Miller et al (US4,523,743) in view of Kissinger (US6,082,432), the Examiner cites the weather strip features 96 (Figures 13 to 15) of Miller for showing brush means on the upright styles of the sliding screen frame and states that it would be obvious to a person skilled in the art to take Miller's door and screen assembly and, following Kissinger's teaching to use opposing brushes "on respective sides of the frame", to modify Miller's screen to do the same in order to "increase the pressure between the members and the brushes". It is the Examiner's position that this is equivalent to what Applicant is claiming, but it most certainly is not.

In the presently amended main claims, Claims 15 and 26, the characterising feature of the invention is the provision of a first brush extending substantially the full length (i.e., height) of one of the lateral sides of the slideable frame and positioned such that it passes closely over the surface of the static panel of the door and with a corresponding second brush on the jamb of the door against which the trailing lateral side of the slideable fly screen frame comes to rest when the screen is

drawn closed, the second brush extending substantially the length (i.e., height) of the jamb and serving to cooperatively engage with the first brush that is on the fly screen frame in order to seal the edge of the trailing lateral side of the slideable frame against ingress by insects.

Thus, there is one brush extending up the trailing edge upright of the fly screen and another brush extending up the upright door jamb and which, when the fly screen is drawn to its closed position, cooperatively engage (i.e., abut and suitable mesh with each other, whereby a more effective seal against ingress of insects is provided (and which also serves as a gentle but firm end stop for the closure of the fly screen).

By contrast, Miller has only a weather strip 96 extending up the lateral side of the upright 112 of his screen frame. This weather strip 96 is positioned quite distantly from the static panel and does not pass closely over the surface of the static panel but does ride on to the jamb of the static panel to provide a weather seal there against. Miller does not teach or propose use of a corresponding weather strip or brush on the jamb to cooperatively engage with the brush on the screen upright 112.

Turning to Kissinger, this relates to a roller blind type fly screen that is adapted to be rolled out across the doorway and which has a leading edge upright, but no trailing edge upright and which does not have any horizontal bars to form a frame around the fly screen. Because the roller-type fly screen of Kissinger has no horizontal bars to give it a rigid framework it instead relies upon the use of opposing brushes mounted to the track for the fly screen. The brushes 35, 36 as shown on Figures 5 and 7 of Kissinger are necessary to stabilize the fly screen mesh panel as is clearly stated at, for example, Column 2, lines 37 to 44 of Kissinger. The use of these of these

opposing brushes is quite logical in the context of Kissinger's apparatus but teaches nothing towards the present invention. Kissinger teaches the use of opposing brushes on either side of a mesh screen to prevent it from gapping. This has no relevance whatsoever to either Miller or the present invention in which the fly screen is rigidly defined by a frame and does not require opposing brushes in the track to maintain its stability. The person skilled in the art on reading Kissinger would certainly not take anything from it of any relevance to the present problem and certainly would not end up with the present arrangement. Our arrangement whereby the brush on the upright jamb and the brush on the upright member of the fly screen frame are configured to cooperatively engage/abut each other when the fly screen is drawn to its closed position is by no means taught or suggested by any of this cited prior art.

It will be noted that Kissinger's opposing brushes do not increase the pressure between frame members and brushes as suggested by the Examiner. Their role is simply to stabilize the fly screen mesh from the opposing sides of the mesh. There is no mention or suggestion that the brushes apply any pressure let alone providing increased pressure when opposed to each other. Furthermore, the arrangement of brushes is completely different from the arrangement of the brushes in the present invention.

Finally, Applicant hereby requests a one-month extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action. A PTO-2038 form in the amount of \$55.00 is enclosed herewith for the official fee associated therewith. In the event of any deficiency for the required amount for an extension of time, please debit Deposit Account No. 07-0130.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that there is nothing in any of this prior art that teaches or suggests the present invention as now claimed.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas M. Galgano
Registration No. 27,638
GALGANO & BURKE
Attorney for Applicant
300 Rabro Drive - Suite 135
Hauppauge, NY 11788
Tel: (631) 582-6161
Fax: (631) 582-6191

F:\G&b\1182\44\amend.wpd